



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,886	02/12/2001	SadAo Ito	1232-4685	9637

27123 7590 03/25/2004
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10154

EXAMINER

ROSEN, NICHOLAS D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/781,886

Applicant(s)

ITO ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas D. Rosen

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-47 have been examined.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract should be one paragraph.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line of claim 15, "a mechanical parts material" seems to be an error for "mechanical parts material information". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line "each base" lacks proper antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 28-33 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the fourth line of claim 28, "parts ;" should be "parts;". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line of claim 35, "a mechanical parts material" seems to be an error for "mechanical parts material information". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line "each base" lacks proper antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 41-43 are objected to because of the following informalities: A computer-readable medium cannot contain steps, although it may contain computer-readable instructions for causing a computer to carry out steps. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 44 and 45 are objected to because of the following informalities: A computer-readable medium cannot contain steps, although it may contain computer-readable instructions for causing a computer to carry out steps. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 46 and 47 are objected to because of the following informalities: A computer-readable medium cannot contain steps, although it may contain computer-readable instructions for causing a computer to carry out steps. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 7

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522). As per claim 1, Peterson discloses an information providing system, comprising: a database storing price information about objects at a plurality of bases (column 13, line 42, through column 14, line 16; column 15, lines 16-57, especially line 55 for price information); and display control means for displaying price information about the objects at said plurality of bases stored in said database on display means (column 13, line 42, through column 14, line 16; column 15, lines 16-57; column 22, lines 15-47).

As per claim 7, Peterson discloses that the display control can further display cost cutting information (column 15, line 58, through column 16, line 3).

Claim 8

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522). Peterson discloses a database storing parts information (column 13, line 42, through column 14, line 16; column 15, lines 16-57); specifying means for specifying parts (column 15, lines 16-57); and control means for displaying the parts information corresponding to the parts specified by said specifying means after searching said database for the information (column 15, lines 16-57; column 22, lines 15-47).

Claims 14, 16, 18, and 20

Claims 14, 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leal et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,437). As per claim 14, Leal discloses an information providing system, comprising: a database storing material information (Figures 1 and 2; column 3, line 46, through column 4, line 37); specifying means for specifying material (column 4, lines 32-37 and 57-64; column 5, line 66, through column 6, line 54), and control means for displaying material information corresponding to the material specified by said specifying means after searching said database for the information (column 4, line 65, through column 5, line 8; column 6, lines 17-54).

As per claim 16, Leal discloses that said databases stores amount-of-money information and/or unit price information about materials (column 4, line 65, through column 5, line 6).

As per claim 18, Leal discloses that said database stores weight information about materials (column 4, line 65, through column 5, line 6).

As per claim 20, Leal discloses that said database stores at least one of specification information, approved color information, and environment information about materials (column 5, lines 23-65; column 6, lines 23-47).

Claims 21 and 27

Claims 21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522). Claims 21 and 27 are closely parallel to claims 1 and 7, respectively, and anticipated by Peterson for essentially the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 1 and 7.

Claim 28

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522). Claim 28 is closely parallel to claim 8, and anticipated by Peterson for essentially the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 8.

Claims 34, 36, 38, and 40

Claims 34, 36, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leal et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,437). Claims 34, 36, 38, and 40 are closely parallel to claims 14, 16, 18, and 20, respectively, and anticipated by Leal for essentially the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 14, 16, 18, and 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2-6

Claims 2, 3, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kojima et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0078862). As per claim 2, Peterson arguably does not expressly disclose that said display control means displays unit price information about the objects at said plurality of bases, although Peterson discloses displaying the price of the item for each owner having a part for sale (column 15, lines 49-57), but Kojima teaches displaying unit price information about objects (Figure 46; paragraph 170). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce to have the display control means display unit price information about the objects at said plurality of bases, for the obvious advantage of enabling potential purchasers to compare unit prices, often an important factor in deciding where to make purchases.

As per claim 3, Peterson does not expressly disclose that said display control means displays the unit price information about the objects at the plurality of bases, and a total quantity and/or a total amount of money, but Kojima teaches displaying unit price information about objects and a total quantity and total amount of money (Figure 46; paragraph 170). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce to have the display control means display unit price information about the objects at said plurality of bases and/or total amount of money, for the obvious advantage of enabling potential purchasers to compare unit prices, often an important factor in deciding where to make purchases, and track total prices, important in authorizing purchases, keeping financial records, etc.

As per claim 4, Peterson does not expressly disclose that said display control means displays an amount of money based on a present currency of the bases (although the prices disclosed by Peterson would presumably be in a present currency of the bases), but Kojima teaches displaying an amount of money based on a present currency of a seller (Figures 17 and 46; paragraphs 100 and 170). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce to display an amount of money based on a present currency of the bases, for the obvious advantage of informing potential purchasers of how much desired parts cost.

As per claim 6, Peterson discloses displaying the price of the item for each owner having a part for sale (column 5, lines 49-57), implying the display of difference in unit prices among the plurality of owners/bases if the prices are different, as in general they would be.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson and Kojima as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of the McKendrick, "ResQ!Net.com Gives 5250 a Complete Makeover." Peterson does not disclose that said display control means further displays an exchange rate, but McKendrick teaches displaying an exchange rate (paragraph beginning "Version 3.2 of the product"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to display an exchange rate, for the obvious advantage of enabling a potential purchaser to determine the cost of a desired object offered by a particular seller in the currency of concern to the potential purchaser.

Claims 9-13

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Kuribayashi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,334,115). As per claim 9, Peterson does not expressly disclose that said database stores electronic parts information and/or mechanical parts information, but Kuribayashi teaches storing electronic parts information (column 1, lines 5-34, etc.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the database store electronic parts information and/or mechanical parts

information, for the obvious advantage of providing information about, and making sales of, parts of a well-known and common kind.

As per claim 10, Peterson does not expressly disclose that said database stores at least one of catalog image information, specification information, quality approval information, and unit price information (although the price information in Peterson could be considered unit price information, and other information about parts could be considered specification information), but Kuribayashi teaches storing catalog image information (Abstract; column 2, lines 23-40; Figures 27 28, 29, 30, and 31). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have said database store at least one of catalog image information, specification information, quality approval information, and unit price information, for at least the stated advantage of assisting a purchaser in determining whether and how parts can be mounted in combination with other parts.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Harris (U.S. Patent 6,304,854). Peterson does not expressly disclose that said database stores information about substitutable parts, but Harris teaches a database which stores information about substitutable parts (column 2, line 57, through column 4, line 22). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the database store information about substitutable parts, for the stated advantage (see Harris, column 1,

line 62, through column 2, line 53) of assisting consumers in purchasing comparable products at lower prices.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Lynch et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0035463). Peterson's database can be described as storing product and parts information (column 13, line 42, through column 14, line 16; column 15, lines 16-57; etc.), but Peterson does not disclose that said control means displays information about a product for which the parts specified by said specifying are used after searching said database for the information. However, Lynch teaches displaying information about a product for which specified parts are used (paragraphs 27-29, 163-165, and 183). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have said control means display information about a product for which the parts specified by said specifying are used after searching said database for the information, for the stated advantage of assisting purchasers in determining the cost of such a product, and the obvious advantage of assisting consumers in learning about the capacities and appearance of such a product.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Dunphy et al. (U.S. Patent 6,484,182). Peterson does not disclose that said database stores information about environment of parts, but Dunphy teaches including information about the environment of parts in a database (column 9, lines 31-41).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the database store information about environment of parts, for the obvious advantages of assisting potential purchasers in selecting parts which will function in a given environment, and alerting potential purchasers to which environments parts can be expected to function as described in.

Claims 15, 17, and 19

Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,437) as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Sebastian (U.S. Patent 5,552,995). As per claim 15, Leal does not expressly disclose that said database stores resin material information and/or a mechanical parts material (mechanical parts material information?), but Sebastian teaches a database storing resin material information (column 16, lines 30-36). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the database store resin material information and/or a mechanical parts material, for at least the obvious advantage of providing relevant information about resins, an important class of materials.

As per claim 19, Leal discloses a database storing material information, but not exactly product information, and does not disclose that said control means displays information about the products in which the materials specified by said specifying are used after searching said database for the information. However, Sebastian discloses a database storing material information and product information (e.g., column 4, lines 36-

57; column 19, lines 57-67); and discloses displaying information about products in which the specified materials are used after searching said database for the information (column 5, line 48, through column 6, line 34; column 15, lines 9-31; column 16, lines 13-36; column 22, line 18, through column 23, line 30; claims 32 and 33).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,437) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522). Leal does not expressly disclose that said amount-of-money information and/or unit price information are stored for each base, but Peterson teaches displaying the price of an item for each owner having an item of a given type for sale (column 15, lines 49-57). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have said amount-of-money information and/or unit price information stored for each base, for the obvious advantage of enabling potential purchasers to buy from the cheapest source.

Claims 22-26

Claims 22, 23, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Kojima et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0078862); and in the case of claim 25, also in view of McKendrick. Claims 22-26 are closely parallel to claims 2-6, respectively, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

Claims 29-33

Claims 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Kuribayashi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,334,115) as per claims 29 and 30; and further in view of Harris (U.S. Patent 6,304,854) as per claim 31; and further in view of Lynch et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0035463) as per claim 32; and further in view of Dunphy et al. (U.S. Patent 6,484,182) as per claim 33. Claims 29-33 are closely parallel to claims 9-13 respectively, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

Claims 35, 37, and 39

Claims 35, 37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,437) as applied to claims 34 and 36 (for claim 37) above, and further in view of Sebastian (U.S. Patent 5,552,995) as per claims 35 and 39; and further in view of Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as per claim 37. Claims 35, 37, and 39 are closely parallel to claims 15, 17, and 19, respectively, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

Claims 41-43

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of official notice. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) and official notice, and further in view of Kojima et al. (U.S.

Patent Application Publication 2003/0078862) as applied to claims 2 and 3 above.

Claims 41, 42, and 43 are essentially parallel to claims 1, 2, and 3, respectively;

Peterson does not disclose a computer-readable medium storing instructions for carrying out the recited steps, but official notice is taken that computer-readable media storing instructions are well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to store instructions for carrying out the steps of claims 41, 42, and 43 on a computer-readable medium, for the obvious advantage of enabling a computer to carry out the method.

Claims 44 and 45

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) as applied to claim 8 above and further in view of official notice. Claim 45 is rejected as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,324,522) and official notice, and further in view of Lynch et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0035463) as applied to claim 12 above. Claims 44 and 45 are essentially parallel to claims 8 and 12, respectively; Peterson does not disclose a computer-readable medium storing instructions for carrying out the recited steps, but official notice is taken that computer-readable media storing instructions are well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to store instructions for carrying out the steps of claims 44 and 45 on a computer-readable medium, for the obvious advantage of enabling a computer to carry out the method.

Claims 46 and 47

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,437) as applied to claim 14 above and further in view of official notice. Claim 45 is rejected as being unpatentable over Leal et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,437) and official notice, and further in view of Sebastian (U.S. Patent 5,552,995) as applied to claim 19 above. Claims 46 and 47 are essentially parallel to claims 14 and 19, respectively; Leal does not disclose a computer-readable medium storing instructions for carrying out the recited steps, but official notice is taken that computer-readable media storing instructions are well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to store instructions for carrying out the steps of claims 46 and 47 on a computer-readable medium, for the obvious advantage of enabling a computer to carry out the method.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kusaba et al. (U.S. Patent 5,321,804) disclose a chemical data handling system. Reuhl et al. (U.S. Patent 5,873,069) disclose a system and method for automatic updating and display of retail prices. O'Neill et al. (U.S. Patent 6,219,653) disclose a freight calculation system and method of operation. Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent 6,574,672) disclose a system, apparatus, and method for providing a portable customizable maintenance support computer communications system.

The anonymous article, "Consumer Internet Shopping Hits Globetrotting Stride with 'Shopping Explorer,'" discloses updating exchange rates for prices. The anonymous article, "Taylor Stuart Financial Initiates Coverage on Pro Net Link with a Strong Buy," discloses data on exchange rates in the context of a catalog/product display.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen whose telephone number is 703-305-0753. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on 703-308-1344. (Wynn Coggins is currently on assignment elsewhere in the Patent Office; the examiner's acting supervisor, Jeffrey Smith, can be reached at 703-308-3588.) The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 703-746-5574.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas D. Rosen
NICHOLAS D. ROSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
March 20, 2004